STATE OF LOUISIANA

Division of Administration
Office of Technology Services

AMENDMENT 2

For:

Create and Implement Unique Statewide Student Identifier System

RFP #: 815200-20141001001

Amendment Date: October 20, 2014

1.1   PURPOSE

Amendment #2 provides a response to written inquiries received as a result of the initial posting and subsequent changes to the RFP in accordance with the schedule established in the RFP.

THIS AMENDMENT IS HEREBY OFFICIALLY MADE A PART OF THE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.

1.2   QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

1. Referencing Section 1.1 (page 5 of the RFP), if implementation is no later than May 1, 2015, does the State have a target date for the start of UAT?

   The State does not have a target date for the start of the UAT and expects the Contractor to propose a start date as part of its project plan.

2. Again referencing Section 1.1 (page 5), is the State open to a phased approach to completing all requirements as stated in this RFP?

   No, Act 837 requires the State to complete all requirements in the RFP by the dates described in the RFP. It is possible that some modifications to LDE's data systems can occur later; however, that work will be authorized through work orders with timelines negotiated separately.

3. Referencing Section 1.1 (page 5), the RFP reads: "The State estimates that this will require converting approximately 18 million student records in assessment files and 2.8 million records in data systems and the data warehouse." Is the structure of the assessment files consistent? Can a sample of the structure and data contained be provided for reference?

   The layout of the assessment files is not consistent as there is a different layout for each type of assessment. Although the layout can vary for each year, the same assessment file is similar year to year with slight annual changes. The State will provide file formats to the Contractor once the work begins.

4. As a follow up to the previous question, please provide a list of data systems where the historical data must be converted to use the unique student identifier.

   All modifications to LDE's systems will be authorized via a work order, so the Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

   As described in section 1.2 of the RFP (page 11), the primary data systems and related reports that will need to be modified include but are not limited to:

   - *Student Information System (SIS)*
   - *Special Education Records (SER)*

- *Student Transcript System (STS) and Official Transcript System (OTS)*
- *Louisiana Education Data Repository System (LEDRS)*
- *Scholarships for Education Excellence (SEE)*
- *Curriculum Verification and Results (CVR)*

The State may choose to authorize a work order to make modifications to additional systems.

5. As another follow up to the previous question, who is responsible to convert the above data systems to use the unique student identifier system?

   The legacy systems will be converted through the use of internal resources, staff augmentation, or a combination of both.

6. As another follow up to the previous question, if the data conversion is the vendor responsibility, please provide the technical design, user manual, functional specifications of each data system and data warehouse that is in-scope.

   The legacy systems will be converted to use the new unique identifier system through the use of internal resources, staff augmentation, or a combination of both. The Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

7. Again referencing Section 1.1 (page 5), are the 2.8 million records stored in the same database format (for example, SQL Server) or different database formats (specifically older records)?

   The 2.8 million records are stored in SQL Server.

8. Referencing Section 1.1 (page 5), the RFP reads: "… creating new edit checks, updating reports, and implementing and enhancing role-based security to LDE's data systems." What is meant by creating new edit checks specifically and which systems does this pertain to specifically?

   The legacy systems will be converted to use the new unique identifier system through the use of internal resources, staff augmentation, or a combination of both. The Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

   Because LDE's data systems will no longer receive PII and will instead receive the new unique identifier, existing data edits will have to be modified or removed and additional ones added to accommodate this change.

9. Again referencing this paragraph in Section 1.1 (page 5), what existing roles for role-based security are in place with LDE's data systems, and what additional types of roles are expected to be added?

The legacy systems will be converted to use the new unique identifier system through the use of internal resources, staff augmentation, or a combination of both. The Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

LDE's data systems currently use active directory. Additional roles, if any, would be determined through the analysis and design by the Contractor.

10. Referencing Section 1.1 (page 6), the RFP reads: "the State also expects the Contractor to train local education agency staff on how to effectively use the system, including training on how to integrate it with their student information systems." Are "Local Education Agency Staff" or LEAs considered the staff at each Parish School System? If not, please explain.

    Yes, they are considered the staff.

11. Again referencing this paragraph in Section 1.1 (page 6), are there standard student information systems in use at all LEAs statewide or are they able to use any system of their choosing?

    LEAs are able to use a student information system of their choice; however, the local student information system must be able to export the data into a format that LDE systems accept. It is important to note that some LEAs do not have a local system and instead enter data directly into LDE's data systems via an online portal.

12. Again referencing the aforementioned paragraph, if they are able to use any system they would like, do we have an estimate on approximately how many different systems are in use?

    There are approximately 10-15 different LEA local systems in use.

13. Again referencing the aforementioned paragraph, is the training intended to be specific to the individual student information systems in place at each LEA? Or more general and the same across each LEA?

    The training will be the same across each LEA.

14. Referencing Section 1.2 (page 6), we assume the new SSID system functionality required of interfacing with other Statewide systems is limited to generation of the unique SSID and ID maintenance (such as merges, temporary IDs, etc.). Please confirm.

    In addition to generating the unique identifiers, the unique statewide student identifier system should include validation of a unique identifier and related student demographics (see 1.1.2.3 and 1.1.3.5) and the ability to provide PII data to existing data collection systems in the case of parental consent or audit.

15. Again referencing Section 1.2, does the State have a top level timeline or order of events for putting the SSID system in place, conversion and cleanup of data, modification of the data

warehouse, modifications of interfacing systems, and use by LEA's? When do you envision other systems' use of the SSID (i.e. timeline)?

The legacy systems will be converted to use the new unique identifier system through the use of internal resources, staff augmentation, or a combination of both. The Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

Act 837 requires the State to complete all requirements in the RFP by the dates described in the RFP. It is possible that some modifications to LDE's data systems can occur later; however, that work will be authorized through work orders with timelines negotiated separately.

16. Again referencing Section 1.2, in consideration of the aggressive timeline for development of the SSID system, what is your expectation for completion of all training?

    Training must be completed by June 1, 2015.

17. Referencing Section 1.2 (page 6), the RFP reads: "In making this transition, the State seeks to minimize the burden on local education agencies (LEAs) by providing multiple means to integrate with the unique statewide student identifier system and training on how to effectively use the system." What typical types of routine / non-routine activities do the LEAs require that would involve the statewide Student Identifier System? Which activities generally involve the LEA submitting multiple students at the same time for example?

    Entering or updating a student in their student information system would involve the use of the unique statewide student identifier system as well as enrolling transfer students. The state collects student-level data during specific times of the year that are used for things like allocating funding, federal reporting, school accountability, and teacher evaluation. LEAs must submit data on all of their students during these submission periods. The submissions vary based on the system and type of data required.

18. Referencing Section 1.2 (page 7), the RFP reads: "Records containing valid unique student identifiers will have the PII data removed from the record and submitted to the appropriate LDE data systems for processing." If the LEA uploads data collection files with PII that already have an MPI unique ID, are these expected to be validated against PII too (regardless of activity)? For example, when requesting a transcript, or other tasks not specifically pertaining to validation.

    Yes, they are expected to be validated as well.

19. Referencing Section1.2 (page 7), the RFP reads: "Modify LDE's existing system edits to allow blanks in PII fields, which includes deleting existing PII edits and adding edits to ensure PII fields being loaded are blank or null." Presently do any existing systems have a UI that allows for updates to PII? If so, which ones?

    Yes, SIS, STS, SER, and CVR allow updates to students' PII.

20. Referencing Figure 1 (page 9), what are the plans for making the interfacing systems available for testing?

The State has three environments for their data collection systems – testing, staging and production. The testing and staging environments would be available for work on the existing data collection systems. These environments are not available for development of the unique identifier system.

21. Referencing Section 1.2 (page 11), the RFP lists the primary data systems and related reports that will need to be modified, including but not limited to:
    a. Student Information System (SIS)
    b. Special Education Records (SER)
    c. Student Transcript System (STS) and Official Transcript System (OTS)
    d. Louisiana Education Data Repository System (LEDRS)
    e. Scholarships for Education Excellence (SEE)
    f. Curriculum Verification and Results (CVR); Are all of these primary data systems presently web-based and accessible to LEAs via login?

Yes, they are web-based and accessible to LEAs via login.

22. Referencing the aforementioned list of primary data systems, if any of them are web-based, do users access these portals with the same username and password across all data systems (for example, through Active Directory)?

Yes, the users access the portals via the same username and password.

23. Referencing the aforementioned list of primary data systems, are there any existing APIs for any of the existing applications listed?

No, there are not any existing APIs.

24. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1, who will be the authorized users that can access the Web Application?

Access to the web application will be limited to LEAs, state staff authorized to conduct audits or receive data to which parents have given consent, and the Contractor.

25. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1, please provide the following details for all the dashboard reports that must be presented on the web application:
    a. Report name
    b. Description
    c. Data to be presented
    d. Report Format

These reports do not currently exist, so the State expects to work with the Contractor to develop these reports.

26. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1, please provide the business process flows, actors, task details for the workflow tasks associated with the web application.

    The workflows will be related to assignment of the unique identifiers, such as the matching process, issue resolution, and any other aspect of the assignment that would require staff interaction.

27. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), how long are the alternative IDs typically kept for a student?

    There is no time limit on how long alternative identifiers are kept.

28. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), can a student have multiple alternative IDs? If a student record already has an alternative ID, should a new one be created for a new research project?

    Yes, a student can have multiple alternative identifiers, and yes, a new alternative identifier should be created for a new research project.

29. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), are these alternate IDs auto-generated or user-generated?

    These alternate identifiers should be auto-generated.

30. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), can a Unique ID be mapped to more than one alternate ID?

    Yes, a unique identifier can be mapped to more than on alternate identifier.

31. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), will an Alternate ID be used to submit or lookup data through the API or website?

    No, it will not be used to submit or look up data.

32. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.7 (page 41), please clarify the need for these alternate IDs. How are these alternate IDs related to the Statewide Unique Student Identifier?

    Alternate IDs are used with researchers to provide them with student-level data and protect student privacy by not disclosing PII.

33. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.8 (page 41), are temporary IDs issued automatically if there isn't enough data to create a permanent ID? If not, is it the user's decision to request

a temporary ID? If based on user decision, how does the API know to create a temporary ID vs. a permanent ID?

The decision to create a temporary ID is the user's decision. The API should include functionality that would allow the user to indicate they want a temporary ID.

34. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.8 (page 41), do temporary IDs need to be visibly different than permanent IDs?

Yes, they should be visibly different than permanent identifiers.

35. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.10 (page 41), in what format will the LEAs submit the data to the Student Identifier system?

LEAs will submit the data to the unique statewide student identifier system in a fixed length record format. Examples of these record formats can be found under User Guides located on this webpage: http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center.

36. As a follow up to the previous question, to what LDE data systems must the Student Identifier System send data to?

The primary systems to which the unique statewide student identifier system should submit student-level data are SIS, STS, and SER.

37. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.1.10 (page 41), what LDE data systems will the unique statewide student identifier system be submitting data to? By which mechanism will that data be transmitted: REST, SOAP, SQL, etc.?

The primary systems to which the unique statewide student identifier system should submit student-level data are SIS, STS, and SER. The mechanism would be determined upon working with the Contractor.

38. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.2.2 (page 42), will matching need to occur when submitting new student information through the API? What type of matching will need to occur before issuing a new unique ID to ensure duplicates aren't created?

Yes matching will occur, and if no exact match is found, the API should return possible matches as described in 1.1.4.3.

39. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.3 (page 43), when a LEA user logs into the system, what type of information will they see on their dashboard? What type of information is to be shown on a LDE user's dashboard?

The State expects to work with the Contractor to finalize the display of the dashboard; however, the State expects the dashboards to include information like key metrics, error reports, links to reports, issue resolution, record matching/unique ID creation, student

record maintenance, audit trail records, training documentation, including user guides, and user account maintenance, including security.

40. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.3.2 (page 43), what type of tasks shown in the worklist will require a workflow?

    The workflows will be related to assignment of the unique identifiers, such as the matching process, issue resolution, and any other aspect of the assignment that would require staff interaction.

41. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.4.4 (page 45), please specify the following report details that must be presented:
    a. Report name
    b. Description
    c. Data to be presented.

    The State expects to work with the Contractor to finalize the exact data elements in the reports. They should include data like potential matches and duplicates.

42. Again, referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.4.4, what is the purpose of the match results report? Please describe the content of these reports.

    The purpose of the match results report is to monitor the system to ensure it's working correctly.

43. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.4.5 (page 45), what type of queries would be likely to run which would require email notifications when they are complete? In other words, what is the purpose of email notifications for these queries?

    Types of email notifications could include but are not limited to the generation of new identifiers, changes to demographic information, merge of records, or any large-scale change that affects a large number of students.

44. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5 (page 45), please define steps in workflow and approval chain.

    LEAs will manage the assignment of unique identifiers. They will determine through the unique statewide student identifier system whether a new student should receive a new unique identifier or should retain a unique identifier. The State will audit any potential duplicate students.

45. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5, is approval required before official assignment of the Unique Identifier?

    No, approval is not required.

46. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5, what type of matching issues would require resolution? Would an LEA request help with matching thorough workflow? What type of user would resolve the match?

    Example matching could include but are not limited to: unable to locate unique identifier for a student who claims to have been enrolled, unable to locate a specific unique identifier, or determining which potential match is the correct match.

47. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5.7 (page 46), please further define "splits and merges" by providing either an example or business case.

    An example of a split is one identifier to which multiple students are assigned the same unique identifier. A merge is a student with multiple identifiers that need to be combined into one. An example of a possible need to split records would be two twins that were assigned the same unique identifier with similar names and identical demographics.

48. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5.14 (page 47), who is ideally expected to serve the role as "records maintenance": LDE or Contractor?

    The State expects the Contractor to serve the role of "records maintenance."

49. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.5.15 (page 47), are the changes to current DOE systems the only source code that must be on .NET platform?

    Yes.

50. Referencing Attachment 1, Section 1.1.5.15 (page 47), can the MPI system be written in a language & server platform that utilizes the best performance / security if it is not .NET?

    Yes.

51. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.6.1 (page 47), is there an expectation of anticipated status states (used in other LDE systems or envisioned) that can be provided with descriptions to help shed light on the anticipated activities from other LDE systems that will engage with the MPI database?

    In general, the MPI database will need to send and receive data from the LDE data systems. The State will work with the Contract to define the specific requirements.

52. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.6.1 (page 47), are "records unresolved" records that are unmatched? Are there other types of records that would be considered "unmatched"?

    Yes, an unresolved record is an unmatched record. It could also include one student with multiple identifiers or multiple identifiers assigned to one student.

53. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.6.2 (page 47), which users are able to escalate a record? How is escalation defined for a record?

    LEA and LDE users can escalate a record. An escalate record is defined as a record that requires additional support for resolution or is an error.

54. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.6.4 (page 47), reports and summaries are required at the LEA and Statewide level. Are reports required at the site level?

    Yes, reports are also required at the site level.

55. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.8.1 (page 49), will access to individual components of the unique identifier system need to be configurable within the application base on their assigned role? For example, an Administrator would be able to give the role "Data Writer" the capability to view or not view reports. If so, please list the functional capabilities which would be configurable.

    Yes, the system will need to be configurable within the application based on their assigned role. The functional capabilities will be determined through working with the Contractor.

56. Again referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.8.1, will the capability for LEA and Site level authorization restrictions be required?

    Yes, the capability for LEA and site-level authorization restrictions will be required.

57. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.8.7 (page 49), is the capability of decentralized management of user roles and role assignment to be integrated with the current system that currently manages LDE security roles? Will the ability to manage and assign the roles of the Unique Statewide Student Identifier System need to be incorporated into the current LDE Security management system?

    It does not need to be incorporated into the current LDE Security management system.

58. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.9.4 (page 50), where will the usernames and passwords be created and stored for access to the MPI databases (for example, for validation, etc.)?

    The State expects the Contractor to determine where the usernames and passwords will be created and stored.

59. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.1.10.2 (page 52), what specific actions would be ideal for LDE or LEA users to be able to complete from a mobile device?

    Users should be able to securely access reports.

60. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.2 paragraph 2 (page 52), would it be more efficient to modify the submission formats from the LEA's to have the UID and the current layout? This would greatly reduce the duplicate processing and ensure that the student data from the LEA can be correctly verified by the LEA.

    LEAs will have to modify their submission format to accommodate the new unique identifier.

61. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.2 paragraph 2 (page 52), where are the specifications for the submission of all current LDE data requirements (SIS, LEADS, etc.) to the UID system? Currently LEA's login to the LEADS portal to submit this data. Does the RFP require duplicating that software?

    Examples of these record formats can be found under User Guides located on this webpage. http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/data-center

    The RFP does not require duplicating the LEADS portal. It is envisioned that the interaction with the Unique ID System would be integrated with the current data submission portal.

62. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.2 paragraph 2 (page 52), the process of auditing the state transmission (SIS, LEADS, etc.) is not defined in the scope of the technical requirements. Does the UID system need to recreate every submission audit for the PII data or only the data needed to validate the UID?

    No, the unique statewide student identifier system only needs to validate the demographic data needed to validate the unique student identifiers.

63. Referencing Attachment I, Section 1.2 (page 53), which information will be de-identified before sending data to LDE's data system?

    Name, date of birth, and other data elements that could reveal the identity of students like address and social security numbers.

64. Referencing Attachment V: Cost Proposal Requirements, can you make the cost schedules (1-4) available to bidders in a MS-Excel spreadsheet?

    Yes, this was posted in Amendment I to the RFP: *https://wwwprd1.doa.louisiana.gov/OSP/LaPAC/agency/pdf/5850401.pdf.*

65. Referencing Attachment V, Schedule 4, the instructions state that we are to provide an hourly rate for all job categories on Schedule 4, however the sheet appears only to have a summary level hourly rate for each group of skill sets. Please correct either the instructions or the matrix - and provide the matrix in spreadsheet format with formulas built-in, if possible.

    The State requests that Proposers provide an hourly rate for that type of employee and experience level.

66. Will OTS provide copies of all Excel spreadsheets shown in the RFP PDF? This includes, but is not limited to, Attachment I – Scope of Services and Attachment V – Cost Proposal Worksheet with Schedules 1- 4.

Yes, this was posted in Amendment I to the RFP:
https://wwwprd1.doa.louisiana.gov/OSP/LaPAC/agency/pdf/5850401.pdf.

67. Are there any specific project management tools required for managing and reporting project status?

No, there are not any specific project management tools required for managing and reporting project status.

68. The Professional Services Labor Categories identified in Schedule 4 include a complete list of all State identified service level categories. Does the State anticipate that all of these categories will be utilized or only requesting rates upfront to be sure all category rates have been provided ahead of contract signing?

The State expects that these categories could be required and is requesting hourly rates to calculate the staff augmentation costs.

69. What vendors currently provide support for LDE primary data systems / applications identified (SIS, SER, OTS, etc.)?

Currently, all student-level data systems are supported internally except for SER.

70. Does the State expect work to be performed at winning proposer's site, at LDE offices, or a combination of both? Does all work need to be performed in state?

The State expects the work to be performed at the Contractor's site and at LDE's office.

71. Due to the amount of effort required to respond to this RFP, is the State willing to provide a three week extension to the response date? We are working to pull together all Louisiana-based companies and resources for our response.

The State will not grant the requested extension. All proposals are due according to the Calendar of Events in the RFP (October 31, 2014 at 3:00 PM CST).

72. We respectfully request an extension of the due date for our proposals to November 24, 2014.

The State will not grant the requested extension. All proposals are due according to the Calendar of Events in the RFP (October 31, 2014 at 3:00 PM CST).

73. The RFP sets a deadline of May 1, 2015 for development of a system of unique student identification numbers and a deadline of June 1, 2015 for assigning the new unique numbers

to all elementary and secondary students. Does the State have a target date for converting the existing records for interfacing LDE systems to incorporate the new unique identifiers and remove viewing of PII for all other than authorized users?

Yes, Act 837 requires that all students enrolled in Louisiana public schools are assigned their unique identifiers by June 1, 2015.

74. Seven (7) specific LDE data systems were listed as potentially interfacing with the system. What other candidate systems could interface with the system or will require data record modification as part of this project?

All modifications to LDE's systems will be authorized via a work order, so the Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

The State may choose to authorize a work order to make modifications to additional systems.

75. How many anticipated system user roles are defined? Which will have access to PII?

The State expects to define the system user roles with the Contractor.

76. How many staff participants will need direct system training under this project?

The State expects a maximum number of 700 LEA and LDE staff will require direct system training.

77. How is the pricing evaluation score for Professional Services with the 25% weighing determined? What will be used as the basis of cost for the Professional Services component (vs. the fixed price for the deliverables component)?

The pricing evaluation score for Professional Services with the 25% weighting will be done by taking the estimated hours to perform the data collection system modification work and applying the rates provided by the contractor.

78. If the system will be hosted by the Louisiana DOA OTS, please confirm the expectations and vendor responsibility for disaster recovery, uptime, and environment management for the implemented system.

The State will not host the system and expects the Proposer to respond to how it will host the system and provide for disaster recovery as described in 1.1.10.1.

79. Will DOE OTS provide a development, test, and production environment for system development and deployment?

A test, staging, and production environment will be available for work on existing LDE systems. Environments to develop and test the unique statewide student identifier system are the responsibility of the Contractor.

80. Please clarify if the State is looking for a Vendor to build a custom application, procure a commercial off the shelf (COTS) application or transfer a solution from another state that provides the requirements outline in the RFP?

The State does not have a preference.

81. As a follow up to the previous questions, has the State reviewed any COTS products? If so, please list the COTS products that were reviewed.

The State has not reviewed any COTS products.

82. Does the State have any preferred CAOTS products that it is considering for this RFP?

The State does not have any preferred COTS products.

83. As a follow up to the previous question, has the State reviewed any transfer solutions? If so, please list the transfer solutions that were reviewed.

The State has not reviewed any transfer solutions.

84. Does the State have any preferred transfer solution that it is considering for this RFP?

The State does not have any preferred transfer solutions.

85. Can the vendor propose a solution where the new system is hosted by State / IOT?

No, the Proposer cannot propose a solution where the unique statewide student identifier system is hosting by the State.

86. What is the prescribed State standard tool for role-based authentication / authorization?

The State does not have a prescribed standard tool for role-based authentication or authorization.

87. Should a workflow be designed and developed as part of this RFP? If a workflow is to be implemented as part of this project, what is the prescribed State standard tool for workflow management?

Yes, a workflow is required as part of the deliverables that will result from this RFP. The State does not have a prescribed standard tool for workflow management.

88. Please confirm that data migration is not in scope of the vendor services within this RFP.

Any data migration would be handled through professional services and authorized through a work order. The Proposer is not expected to provide an estimate for this work.

89. How many months or post-implementation support does the Vendor need to provide?

   The State reserves the right to extend the contract for up to three years from the date it starts for ongoing support.

90. In continuation to the previous question, should Vendor estimate the cost for Maintenance and Support as part of the response to this RFP? Please clarify.

   The Proposer should only provide costs for the deliverables and professional services pricing.

91. Can the support be provided by offsite team? If yes, please confirm that the State will provide VPN connectivity. If not, please confirm that the State will provide the travel costs, in addition to the support costs.

   Yes, VPN connectivity would be provided.

92. Please confirm that the State is expecting the Vendor to provide a Fixed Price quote for this project.

   Yes, the State is expecting the Proposer to provide a fixed price quote.

93. What is the expected start date of this project?

   This is described in the Calendar of Events Section (2.5) of the RFP.

94. What is the business reason for this end (go-live) date of Dec. 2015)?

   December 2015 is not the go-live date. This is described in the Calendar of Events Section (2.5) of the RFP.

95. Can the vendor propose an alternate go-live date?

   No, the go-live date is required by Act 837.

96. Please provide details on all the External Systems that the new system should interface with.

   All modifications to LDE's systems will be authorized via a work order, so the Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

   As described in section 1.2 of the RFP (page 11), the primary data systems and related reports that will need to be modified include but are not limited to:

   - *Student Information System (SIS)*
   - *Special Education Records (SER)*

- *Student Transcript System (STS) and Official Transcript System (OTS)*
- *Louisiana Education Data Repository System (LEDRS)*
- *Scholarships for Education Excellence (SEE)*
- *Curriculum Verification and Results (CVR)*

The State may choose to authorize a work order to authorize modifications to additional systems.

97. In continuation to the previous question, please provide details on the technology (File Transfer, ETL, Webservice, …) that should be used for these interfaces.

    All modifications to LDE's systems will be authorized via a work order, so the Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work.

98. Again, in continuation to the previous questions, we assume data is both retrieved (Inbound) and published (Outbound) to these external systems. Please clarify.

    Yes, data must be shared in both directions.

99. How many environments does the State have for this project (for example, Development, Testing, Production)?

    A test, staging, and production environment will be available for work on existing LDE systems. Environments to develop and test the unique statewide student identifier system are the responsibility of the Contractor.

100. Does the State have any preference in terms of the database to be used for this proposed new DLS (SQL, Oracle, DB2, …)?

    No, current collection systems use SQL Server.

101. Does the State have any preference in terms of the software development methodology that could be adopted for this project (Waterfall, Agile, …)?

    No, the State does not have a preference in terms of software development methodology.

102. Please confirm if the Vendor project team is expected to be located at State facility throughout the lifecycle of this project development.

    The Contractor's project team is not expected to be located on the State facility throughout the lifecycle of this project.

103. Does State have any preference for onsite / offsite / offshore development?

    The State prefers onsite development.

104.   If the Vendor can propose a less expensive solution, can the Vendor propose an approach where the Vendor has resources located outside of the U.S. (i.e. Canada)?

The State prefers onsite development.

105.   How many onsite Vendor resources can be accommodated by the State?

The State can accommodate at least five cubicles. These cubicles have the ability to have two network connections.

106.   Please confirm that State will not provide a lower score to a Vendor that proposes Offshore application development (for example, an application development center in India).

The State prefers onsite development and cannot commit to not providing a lower score to a Proposer that proposes offshore development.

107.   Does the Vendor staff need to travel to other non-primary locations? If so, please provide the information about the locations, who from Vendor staff needs to visit the locations, time / duration and frequency of such visits.

The Contractor will be required to travel to non-primary locations during regional trainings, which will be located in regions across the state of Louisiana.

108.   Will the State provide onsite parking for the Vendor team members? Is parking available for Vendor personnel free of cost? How many parking spots can be made available for Vendor personnel?

The State will provide onsite parking for free for as many Contractor personnel as needed.

109.   In case of onsite model, please confirm the State will provide necessary office facilities, phones, cubes, pc, software, etc. to the Vendor's onsite resources.

The state would provide office space (cubicles) and network access for onsite workers. This would not include phones, software, computers, etc. That is the responsibility of the Contractor.

110.   In case of offsite service, will State provide VPN access to the Vendor team members?

The State will provide VPN access.

111.   Please confirm that the State will provide the Vendor with production data for testing purposes so that Vendor can verify accuracy of the newly developed system.

The State will provide the Contactor with production data for testing.

112.   How many business days of User Acceptance Testing does the State expect to perform for this application?

The State does not have a target date for the start of the UAT and expects the Contractor to propose a start date as part of its project plan.

113.   Please confirm that the State will provide sample or test data for user and system testing.

The State will provide the Contactor with production data for testing.

114.   Please confirm that the State will be responsible for data loading in the UAT and production environments.

The State will be responsible for data loading in the various environments as it relates to state data collection systems.

115.   Please confirm that no bonds or damages are required under this RFP.

The State confirms that no bonds or damages are required to respond to this RFP. There will not be a bond associated with the contract once the work begins; however, the work that will occur once the Contractor begins is subject to damages in the event of a breach of contract.

116.   Will any preference be given to a particular group of companies (for example, local, non-profit, minority-owned)?

The State will give preference to Louisiana-based small entrepreneurships as described in Section 3.15 of the RFP.

117.   Please confirm if the State will provide necessary hardware and software for this project in all environments.

The Contractor is responsible for providing the necessary hardware and software for this project in all environments as it relates to the unique statewide student identifier system as described in 1.1.10.1.

118.   Please confirm that the State is responsible for the costs of acquiring any 3rd party tools / technology (for example, web server, development and test tools, source code control, database, communication infrastructure) required by various phases of the project.

The Contractor is responsible for providing the necessary hardware and software for this project in all environments as it relates to the unique statewide student identifier system as described in 1.1.10.1.

119.   To provide necessary clarifications during design, development and testing, how many SMEs will be allocated by the State to this project during various phases of the project for further clarifications, reviews, etc.?

Currently, six SMEs contribute significant percentage of their time to this work, and other SME will be engaged as needed.

120. What is the approximate percentage allocations of these SME's to this project?

Currently, six SMEs contribute significant percentage of their time to this work, and other SME will be engaged as needed.

121. Does the Vendor need to integrate with other State of Vendor team(s) to deliver a complete solution? If so, what are such dependencies and what is the integration process?

The Contractor will work directly with LDE to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Additional modifications to LDE's systems will be authorized via a work order, so the Proposer is not expected to provide estimates for this work, including integrating with other Contractor teams.

122. Does the State want the Vendor to use specific templates for project deliverables like Project Reporting, Detailed Requirements Document, Architecture Design document, Deployment Plan, Testing Plan, etc., or is it expected that Vendor templates will be used for the project?

The State expects the Contractor to provide templates that the State will review and approve.

123. In relation to the previous question, if a Vendor needs to use State-provided templates, please provide a copy of the templates so that we have a clear understanding of the level of details required.

The State expects the Contractor to provide templates that the State will review and approve.

124. Does the Vendor need to provide Warranty support after implementation? If so, how many months of warranty does the Vendor need to provide?

The Contractor will need to provide warranty support after implementation, which will be included in the terms of the agreed to contract.

125. In continuation to the previous question, should Vendor estimate the cost for Warranty as part of the response to this RFP? Please clarify.

The Proposer should estimate the cost for warranty in the Cost Proposal Worksheet.

126. Can the warranty be provided by an offsite team? If so, please confirm that the State will provide VPN connectivity. If not, please confirm that the State will provide travel costs, in addition to the support costs.

The State will provide VPN connectivity to the state network where required.

127.   Did the State have assistance from a vendor in writing this RFP? If so, is that vendor permitted to bid on this RFP?

The State did not have assistance from a Vendor in writing this RFP.